

No. 183 JANUARY 1984

# *Spearhead*

50p



**THE I.R.A.**

# ***Time for total war***



# Nationalist comment

# WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

## Murdering the language

'Red Fascism' was the term used by Mrs. Thatcher last month to describe the behaviour of a mob of left-wing Labourites at a meeting of Brent Council on the occasion of the defection of one of their number to the Conservative side of the council chamber. The Labour councillors, according to reports, indulged in a wild orgy of egg-throwing at the defector and at other Tory councillors, with the result that the meeting had to be abandoned.

Mrs. Thatcher's choice of words is rather curious, for whatever such hooligan behaviour amounts to it certainly does not amount to 'Fascism'. Fascism has always stood for **order** and generally it has in practice lived up to this principle. Many people may dislike the brand of order that Fascism imposes, but it is order nevertheless. It is quite true of course that Fascists have been known to be involved in breaches of public order, but in at least 90 per cent of cases this has been as the victims of such breaches rather than as the party which perpetrated them. The perpetrators have in

fact in the vast majority of cases been **communists**, and Communism would indeed have been the most appropriate word for the Prime Minister to have chosen when she described what happened at Brent.

## Sell out in the air

Developments last month concerning the Falklands certainly have done nothing to disprove our contention that the Government is planning a sell-out of the islands, a contention expressed on page 8 of our November issue where we reproduced a *Daily Express* report to that effect.

Following the accession to power in Argentina of a Socialist President and the resulting dismantling of military rule in that country, Mrs. Thatcher took the extraordinary step of sending a message of goodwill to the new Argentine leader, Senor Alfonsín, at a time when the Argentines still had not formally acknowledged an end to hostilities with Britain.

In the message Mrs. Thatcher spoke of her pleasure at the "restoration of democracy" in Argentina and indicated that this event now made possible the re-establishment of normal relations between that country and Britain.

This is nonsense. The question of whether Argentina is governed by a democracy or by a military dictatorship does not have the slightest relevance to the Falklands issue, since the new Government has made clear that it regards the establishment of Argentine sovereignty over the Falklands as still being its long-term objective.

Mrs. Thatcher has said that she is eager to talk to the Argentine Government over the Falklands but – no doubt for consumption at home – has stated that sovereignty over the islands is still not negotiable.

To this we can only reply that since Argentina has not renounced its claim to the Falklands surely there is nothing to talk about!

Not the least disturbing aspect of Mrs.

Thatcher's message is that it was sent to the Argentine Government without the knowledge of, or consultation with, the Falkland Islanders themselves – a disgusting insult to those who are among Britain's most loyal subjects.

## Made abroad

Sometimes a simple personal experience drives home a fact of political importance much more strongly than the reporting of that fact in the national news. Last month millions of us were doing our Christmas shopping. How many, as they examined the goods for sale, were struck by the fact that the vast majority of those goods had foreign labels on them? As one looked in the toy departments of the big stores, the shoe shops, the ladies' and gents' outfitters, the shops selling sports goods, gift items, domestic electricals, home tools, furniture and household decor and a wide range of other items, the story was the same: made in Germany, made in France, made in Japan, made in Hong Kong, made in Korea, even made in Red China!

Anyone doing Christmas shopping 20–25 years ago would have had a totally different experience. Then almost all the items for sale were made in Britain.

Any Christmas shopping expedition today should be enough to convince the ordinary man or woman in the street that British industry is being murdered – wilfully and systematically murdered by this foreign goods invasion. Just count all the British workers who could be in jobs producing the massive number of Christmas gifts which line the windows, shelves and sales counters of our shops at Christmas time, and you have some idea of why today there are 3¼ million out of work today and whose families, in all probability, went short this last Christmas of the goodies families usually expect.

It is a crime. It is a monstrous crime. And the criminals are the men and women in government who have allowed this to happen. They could stop this invasion and they have failed to stop it. Indeed they do not even want to stop it. In obedience to some abstraction of a politico-economic theory called 'free trade', which has miserably failed Britain in the 20th Century, they are quite happy to see a further 3 million thrown on the scrapheap, if necessary. Maybe by next Christmas they will.

## After Harrods...

After the death and destruction, the postures, the platitudes and the promises. Just as it has been following every previous IRA outrage, so it was following the bomb at Harrods last month. On the air came every little hack politician, dripping with crocodile tears for the victims and emitting empty and futile condemnation of the culprits. As a sop to public opinion, 700 extra police were drafted into London for the Christmas shopping period and the Home Secretary assured everyone that he would give some study to the possibility of banning the Sinn Féin party and reintroducing internment in Northern Ireland. The corridors of Westminster and Whitehall hummed with new 'initiatives'. The editors of

# SPEARHEAD

No. 183 JANUARY 1984

Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex

Editor: John Tyndall

*Spearhead* exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.


The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

*Spearhead* welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.





**THE TERROR THAT PAYS**  
Outside Harrods after the bomb

Fleet Street scoured the vocabulary for new words of moral indignation.

But in the end what will be done to stop this terror? By now we all know the answer. *Nothing* will be done. Nothing has been done since the terror broke out in 1969 and nothing will be done in the future. Nothing will be done for two simple reasons: firstly the politicians of Westminster just do not have the will to maintain British rule in Northern Ireland and the terrorists know that they do not have that will. As long as this is demonstrable in all the actions and utterances (private as well as public) of those politicians, the men of violence will be sustained in the belief that that violence need only be kept up and the nerve of the politicians will eventually break; it is only a matter of time.

Secondly, nothing will be done because what **has** to be done to provide any truly effective means of defeating the terrorists offends against every tenet and every teaching of 'liberal' and 'democratic' political morality. The ruthlessness of the terrorists must be matched in degree, and exceeded in efficiency, by the ruthlessness displayed by the forces of national security and order, and those who have governed Britain's affairs during the 20th Century have demonstrated again and again that they are not capable of exercising that ruthlessness, whether it be in the field of legislation, in the judiciary or simply in the orders and equipment given to police and army for the carrying out of their anti-terrorist operations. Our ruling classes, whether they be of the left, the right or the centre, are just too bloody weak and too bloody soft. As always, they will react to terror with the unctious tones of the pulpit rather than the icy resolve of men of war who are in the business

of survival and whose mission is victory.

The men of terror know that too, and this is why the terror will continue.

### Heseltine funks debate

Why did Defence Minister Michael Heseltine funk a TV confrontation with CND chief Monsignor Bruce Kent last month?

Heseltine withdrew from a programme due to be broadcast by Independent Television following the showing of the mammoth anti-nuclear spectacular *The Day After* when he came to believe, contrary to protestations by the programme makers, that he would be sharing a platform with Kent. That the Defence Minister was not prepared to do, and he informed the programme editor that he would not be taking part.

Such a withdrawal does not do Mr. Heseltine much credit. No Government Minister sure of the rightness of his Government's case on a vital public issue should shirk debate on that issue; on the contrary, he should have the confidence that in such a debate he can take on all comers. On the issue of nuclear weapons especially, the case presented by CND is so weak and their arguments so fatuous that any member of the Government worth his salt should be able easily to demolish the disarmers.

There is clearly a chink somewhere in the Government's armoury on the nuclear weapons question. Could that chink be the fact that the Government has committed Britain to a policy of nuclear defence over which she has no effective control but is controlled from Washington? The Cruise missiles now being stationed on British soil can be launched without any consent from the British Government but merely on the order of the President of the United States. Britain could thereby be made a prime target in a nuclear war between the US and Russia without having the slightest say in the matter.

This is the strongest card in the hands of the nuclear disarmers. Mgr. Kent knows it and so, probably, does Mr. Heseltine.

That card could easily be dashed from the hands of CND if Britain were to follow the French model and adopt a policy of totally independent nuclear defence, with no ties with America. The French have realised that a national nuclear force does not have to be as big as those possessed by the US and Russia to be an effective deterrent to nuclear or conventional attack; it merely needs to be big enough to inflict such damage on a would-be attacker that no such attack on his part would be worthwhile. Such a nuclear force is well within the capacity of the national resources of Britain just as it is in the case of France.

### Brotherly love

During the Yuletide season we had a change from previous years and went for a brief holiday in Torquay. On one afternoon, for the sake of the younger generation, we went to the local pantomime, where they were showing 'Goldilocks and the Three Bears'. The panto

was truly an education.

In the show Goldilocks' Mother was the proprietress of a circus, which financially had fallen on hard times. In her plight the good Dame was being constantly pursued with a view to a take-over bid by a rival circus owner, who, naturally, was taking advantage of her desperate situation by offering her far less than her circus possessions were worth.

Now in real life it takes little imagination to guess at the probable racial origins of such a take-over merchant – particularly when it is in the sphere of public entertainment. However, in times like these such a real-life characterisation on the pantomime stage would clearly get the producers into trouble with the Race Relations Board. In 1983/84 there is only one race in the world whom it is permitted to portray in such an unpleasant light with reasonable expectation that a prosecution will not ensue.

Yes, you've guessed it! The take-over tycoon, and the villain of the show who gets booed and hissed everytime he came on stage, is a Herr Heinkel (yes, Heinkel, not Messerschmidt), a light-hued 'Aryan' type with a thick and guttural Teutonic accent. In one scene Herr Heinkel is portrayed trying to poison one of the three bears, who are performers in Goldilocks' Mother's circus; in another he has just obtained purchase of the bears by fraudulent methods and is in the process of beating them savagely with his whip. By the end of the pantomime the young audience has been so whipped up into hatred of Herr Heinkel that it is screaming "shoot him" and "kill him" whenever he appears.

Then as the curtain is about to come down in the finale the cast, in an exhibition of 'chutspah' that beats all records, stands and sings that well known lefty propaganda song "I'd like to teach the world to sing in perfect harmony." Those familiar with the lyrics of this song will know that its theme is a call for brotherly love between all races (Germans obviously excluded).

### Assault on the ears


The other Xmas memory is of evenings in the hotel bar with disco-style 'music' laid on in the background. This is the new music of our brave new world, which it is our duty to listen to whether we like or not. We never get asked whether the music is to our taste; it is just played as if it is as natural to us as food and drink – something which indeed we could not live without if it were cut off.

It is never possible on any occasions to play music that is to the taste of everyone, and far be it for us to demand that the kind of music we like be imposed on others against their will. All we might ask is that, whatever background music be played in restaurants, bars or elsewhere, it is played at sufficiently moderate volume to be ignored by those not keen to hear it and for the latter to be able to enjoy the elementary right to talk and be heard.

No such right, however, seems to exist in this modern age. We have to listen to 'disco', though it may assault the ears and shatter the senses.




# MIDDLE CLASS AWAKENING




1984

"Two coloured people have moved in next door. They're awfully nice. We're inviting them in for tea!"



1985

"Some more coloured people have moved into the street. They're forming quite a community. Occasionally they have a rather noisy party at night, but we don't mind too much — the area could do with a bit of livening up. Live and let live, we say."



1986

"There are rather a lot of coloured people in our street now. Mind you, we're not against them — but they do cause us some sleepless nights with their parties. A lot of the old inhabitants have been moving out — it's a pity because some of them were our friends and we miss them."



1987

"This street really has gone down dreadfully. Almost all our old friends are gone. The area has become dirty and untidy. Night after night we're kept awake by the noise. There's been a number of muggings and one rape. We still believe in the multi-racial ideal — after all these people are British and they're here to stay. But much more money must be spent on educating them to our standards and removing the grievances that make them take to crime. We also need to have much more police protection."



1988

"We're getting absolutely desperate. This area has now become a jungle and a slum. Every night is pandemonium. We dare not go out in the evening any more. Our estate agent told us the other day that the value of our house has gone down by half. We've lost all faith in multi-racialism — these people just aren't the same as us and never will be. Enoch Powell was right after all — there's got to be voluntary repatriation!"



1989

"We're selling up and getting out. We're getting less for our house than we paid 10 years ago, but we just can't bear living here any longer. The last straw came when old Aunt Bess was mugged last week on the way to visiting us — she's still in hospital. We HATE those who brought the immigrants here. We're racists and proud of it — they've all got to go, whether voluntarily or not. We've decided to do the unthinkable — we're joining the BNP!"



# POINTERS TO 1984

A look at  
political strategy  
and tactics  
by IAN SLOAN

RONALD RICKCORD is to be congratulated on his article 'A Strategy for Success', which has come as a breath of fresh air to the Nationalist movement. Mr. Rickcord's contribution has, I believe, served to pinpoint exactly the biggest problem facing us in our task of propagating and converting people to the cause of British Nationalism, this problem being what tactics we should use.

Many so-called Nationalists who in the past have become disillusioned at the failure of Nationalism to break into the 'big time' have invariably gone off to form new parties with a 'cleaner' and more 'respectable' image but which necessitated a watering down of Nationalist policies to such a large degree that they have ended up fighting for something other than that of British Nationalism. Others have formed so-called 'hard-line' groups. These groups posing as 'political' movements have in every instance deteriorated into nothing more than Nazi Germany Fan Clubs.

As events have shown, all these ventures have been dismal failures, showing quite clearly there is nothing wrong with our 'product', i.e. British Nationalism, and that the area that needs to be reappraised is our 'sales promotion', i.e. tactics.

To discover what effect our past tactics have had, one only has to ask an ordinary member of the public "What do you believe Nationalist parties stand for?" If the individual concerned has an opinion at all, their answer will almost certainly be that we are anti-Black. This is an unfortunate answer, as it places us firmly within the pressure group bracket alongside the anti-bloodsports, anti-bomb and numerous other anti-something organisations, suggesting that we are a negative rather than a positive force, a position in which the establishment will be delighted to see us remain. Whilst there can be no doubt that the vast majority of Britons share, to varying degrees, our sentiments on coloured immigration, it also has to be admitted that trying to inform and further trying to persuade the general public to act and act now against the catastrophic consequences of miscegenation has produced disappointing results. Quite clearly the tactic of relying heavily on the race issue has gained us very limited success.

The subject of race, unlike that of unemployment, provokes a strong emotional but temporary reaction. The majority of Britons conveniently push the race issue to

the back of their minds, reassuring themselves that, like the dumping of nuclear waste, it is a problem to be faced by future generations. This attitude will of course make all true Nationalists' blood boil; nevertheless it is an attitude that we have to face as one that we have very little chance of changing due to our, as yet, relatively small propaganda machine. The most important task facing the BNP at the moment is to demolish this myth of ourselves as a one-issue pressure group and to promote ourselves as an all embracing political movement. This must, I believe, involve the promoting of our economic and social policies more to the fore in all our propaganda literature which is designed for public consumption.

## TACKLING UNEMPLOYMENT

Issues such as unemployment have remained for far too long the sole preserve of the Left Wing. By expressing ourselves forcefully on issues regarded by the British populace as immediate problems will, I believe, help generate a greater degree of interest as to the type of society we wish to create and contribute towards the breaking down of the image of ourselves as a one-issue pressure group (with the added bonus of demolishing the crypto-Marxist garbage now being promoted by the racial Marxists).

Only when people actually become involved with the BNP can they gain access to the great wealth of information that exists on the subject of race and be made fully aware that all economic and social policies must take a secondary role until the survival of our people has been secured. In fact I think it would be fair to say that the vast majority of Nationalists before they became involved with our movement had only what could be described as a gut feeling towards the immigration question. Once they were in the party, however, information on the race issue suppressed by the establishment media became readily available, enabling what was just a sound healthy instinct to develop fully into a mature political understanding. This process can be applied successfully on our fellow Britons providing party propaganda in the first instance is sufficiently geared towards arousing public interest. As mentioned earlier, I believe that giving greater

prominence to our economic and social policies will help arouse interest; however, members who have other suggestions should voice them, providing the party with fresh avenues to explore and experiment with.

Another area of Nationalist activity that has recently come under discussion is that of marches and indoor rallies. At the present time it would appear that indoor rallies are by far the most popular, as comparisons in attendances between the two have proved.

Whilst I myself also have a preference for indoor rallies, I would like to make two suggestions with regard to marches. Firstly I would like to suggest that any marches planned for the future should be held in predominantly white areas, as against the policy of the past, when marches were held in, or very close to, immigrant ghettos. My reason for this suggestion is quite simple in that I believe our message is meant for the white people and so it should follow that we should take our message to the white people. Holding a march in Southall is unlikely to win us any converts, although I concede the point that it may win us mass media coverage due to the ensuing mayhem caused by immigrants. On this I must leave it to the reader to decide whether bad publicity is better than no publicity.

The other point I should like to make is that Nationalist marches should be in stark contrast to those of the Left. Nationalist marches must be held in an orderly and disciplined fashion, with members marching in line with one another and comprised of people of a clean and tidy appearance, with every effort being made to obtain a band at the head of the procession, thus symbolically representing the forces of order in contrast to the forces of chaos that the Left conveys. The freaks, weirdos and exhibitionists cannot possibly have a place within Nationalist ranks.

If this be acceptable, now is the time for the Nationalist movement to decide where it stands with regard to the various youth cults that have attached themselves to us, such as the punks and skinheads, etc. Youth cults are adhered to by immature minds that are constantly seeking to shock society, be it fighting at football matches or joining Nationalist marches and chanting "Seig Heil". If young people join the BNP there can be no reconciliation between their loyalties to British Nationalism and their loyalty to negroid music, outrageous clothes, fashions or any other degenerate rubbish which is controlled and promoted by our enemies. Only one or the other may prevail. This ultimatum must, I believe, be given to all those adherents of youth cults. Those with mature minds will recognise this truism and abandon their childish pursuits. Those who do not will be no loss.

Finally, no matter what tactics are decided upon by the BNP leadership, there can be no doubt that many years of toil and struggle lay ahead, but every single extra effort required of us will, I believe, only make our eventual victory that much sweeter.



# NOW AT LAST, THEY ACKNOWLEDGE WE WERE RIGHT!

4 YEARS AGO this very month, in the capacity then of Chairman of the National Front, I convened a meeting of that party's National Directorate and laid down certain terms for the continuation of my job as its senior executive officer. The terms amounted to a series of changes in the party's Constitution which would substantially increase my own decision-making powers and correspondingly decrease the powers of the Directorate. I had for some years lived uneasily with a system for the running of the party in which my own powers as Leader had been ridiculously inadequate for the fulfilment of my responsibilities; I asked merely for a Constitution in which power and responsibility would be brought into some kind of equitable relationship with each other.

I put these facts on record not in order to indulge in self-glorification, for the achievement of the National Front in those two phases was the work of many people, without whose help I could not have succeeded as I did. My purpose is merely to establish that I was not asking the party to confer powers upon one who had not given some past indication that he would use those powers wisely and beneficially in the party interest. I think there is also some useful point in reminding people that those same powers would not necessarily be wielded wisely and beneficially by remaining in the hands of the Directorate, for it was by a decision of that very Directorate that the disastrous leadership had been installed which got the party into such a mess in 1974-76 — a leadership which,



**WEBSTER**

**Removed 4 years too late**

## **As the Front axes Webster, JOHN TYNDALL examines the possibilities of Nationalist unity**

I did not feel that in seeking this change I was lacking in credentials. When I was elected to the NF Chairmanship in 1972 the fortunes of the party were at a low ebb. Membership was below the level of 2,000 and at the last General Election the total number of seats the party had managed to fight was 10. In the course of the next 2 years that membership was more than quadrupled and at the General Election of October 1974 the party was able to fight no less than 90 seats. It had in the meantime begun to become a household word in Britain.

I was rewarded for this achievement by dismissal from the Chairmanship in October 1974 by the majority vote of the Directorate. Under the new Chairman chosen in my place, party fortunes again plummeted between the Autumn of 1974 and the beginning of 1976, at which time I was restored to the leadership after a bitter internal power struggle. The NF then began another upward turn between 1976 and 1979, during which time its membership increased to between 12,000 and 15,000 and at the end of which it was able to contest no less than 301 seats in the General Election of May 1979.

I might add, was furthermore condemned by a High Court judge for its grossly improper use of power during that period.

### **ACTION NEEDED**

By January 1980 I had come to the conclusion that there were internal matters within the party which required quick and decisive action of a kind which I had no confidence that the Directorate had either the wisdom or the courage to take. Of these matters, that which was of the most overwhelming priority was the malignant and destructive influence of Martin Webster — an influence which over some years had had a debilitating effect on party unity and morale in a number of spheres but which had most recently been doubly compounded in its harmful effect by that officer's unrestrained exhibition of his homosexual proclivities.

Beyond the immediate and pressing question of Webster, however, there were other matters in the party which were bothering me. The party was beginning to attract an undesirable element from among

certain sections of the younger generation addicted to some of the more grotesque and decadent youth 'cults', such as football hooliganism, 'punk' hairstyles and negroid music played at a volume which shatters the eardrums and numbs the senses. These elements were starting to drive out the better people and to compromise, by their exhibitionist behaviour in public, the image that I wanted to portray of a disciplined and orderly political movement, dedicated to a fight against degeneracy and a cleaning up of Britain. I never sought the pursuit of the mirage of 'respectability' by a modification of the party's hard-line political doctrines, but I did believe that we could make these doctrines acceptable to a widening circle of the British people by the dignity of the manner in which we campaigned for them, and I could see that dignity being undermined by some of the freakish and loutish types which were being attracted to the NF by the distorted propaganda of our enemies.

I could see on the Directorate little comprehension of the potential danger that these elements represented; on the contrary, there was much evidence of an eagerness to pander to them and fawn upon them as if they were a force for the country's future salvation. This evidence helped to convince me of the need for a substantial tightening up of authority and discipline within the party, starting at the top, and it was clear that a vital prerequisite for this was that greater personal powers should be placed in my hands.

### **INFILTRATION EASY**

One further factor underlined the need for these powers. Looking back on the series of internal troubles that had racked the NF regularly since its inception in the 1960s,

*Contd. on next page*



and in particular a bout of internal trouble through which we had just passed in the previous year of 1979, I recognised that one of the great weaknesses of the party was the ease with which it could be infiltrated and subverted by those who wished it ill. At the root of this weakness lay the party's Constitution, which permitted any Flash Harry or Big Mouth to get himself elected onto the party's ruling body, the Directorate, and from that position and in concert with others of his kind to seize effective control over the party by the organisation of voting caucuses by means of which the party's elected Leader could be rendered little more than a rubber stamp.

All these considerations brought me to a point at which, in January 1980, I decided that the moment could no longer be postponed for an internal overhaul along the lines which I have described. I presented my proposals to the NF Directorate in the form of an ultimatum, to the effect that I would resign the leadership of the party if they were not implemented. Among the internal problems that had brought me to this position I laid the greatest stress on the Webster problem and upon homosexuality as the most urgent aspect of that problem. This was something of a simplification of the issue but it was nonetheless genuine for being that. I was telling the Directorate, in effect, that it would have to choose between Webster and me.

The Directorate, as most of our readers well know, decided to reject my proposals, to accept my resignation from the party leadership and to retain Webster. In accordance with my pledge, I vacated the post of party Chairman with effect from the 31st January 1980.\*

As I did so, I made the following predictions: that the National Front, following the course that the Directorate had chosen, would decline and degenerate to the point at which it would be reduced to a fraction of the membership size it had enjoyed in its peak years in the 1970s; that this decline would likewise be reflected in the party's reduced credibility in the eyes of the British public and thereby manifest in rapidly falling votes; that the scum element would proliferate in the party, further accelerating this loss of credibility; finally that everything that I said about the harmful influence of Webster would be justified and that his removal would in time be recognised as essential.

## PROVED RIGHT

It gives me no particular satisfaction now to be able to say that I, and those who supported me at the time, have been proved right on all these counts — proved right, not only in the observable state of the National Front for all to see, but proved right on the admissions and by the actions in recent weeks of those very people who opposed us in 1980 and who have regularly attacked us

since. Last November two leading members of the NF Directorate sent out a circular to party personnel in which they confirmed all our predictions and subsequent commentaries about the Front's declining fortunes, the diminution of its membership, its loss of public credibility, the reduced attendance on its activities, its state of internal indiscipline and, not least, the baneful role played by Mr. Martin Webster.

Then, a little while after the dispatch of this circular, a meeting of the NF Directorate was convened and a decision taken which that body had overwhelmingly rejected when I proposed it four years previously. Martin Webster was stripped of all his party offices and dismissed as a member of the party's full-time staff.

These developments amount to a total vindication of my own position adopted in 1980 and rejected and condemned at the time, and not only my own position but the position of others in the party who saw things as I did and acted with me — for I do not claim to have been unique and alone, or gifted with any special personal foresight, in anticipating future events; these events could be equally anticipated by any person in the party with a grain of commonsense and mature political judgement, and many others did indeed anticipate them just as I did. Unfortunately, such commonsense and mature judgement were in short supply in the very place where they were most needed: on the NF National Directorate.

## FRUITS OF HEAD-COUNTING

But more than just people have been vindicated; a principle has been vindicated too, and indeed the principle on which we made our stand just 4 years ago this month. This is that the vital judgements and decisions affecting the welfare of a Nationalist party are more likely to be made by an individual leader with a proven track record, answerable and accountable directly to the rank and file



**A. K. CHESTERTON**  
Directorate ganged up on him  
with disastrous results

but nonetheless properly empowered to act, than by a committee which determines everything by a counting of heads.

The procedure of committee control has again and again been put to the test in the National Front and again and again it has been found wanting, with disastrous judgements and decisions made repeatedly. The Directorate read the situation wrong in 1970, when it ganged up on the then Leader of the NF, A. K. Chesterton, and forced him out, causing a slump in the party which continued for 1½ years. The Directorate again read the situation wrong in 1974, when it installed a political adventurer as party Chairman who for the next 15 months led the party into chaos. And it read the situation wrong again in 1980, leading to the catastrophic events with which we are all familiar, and finally to its admission of its own error in what its members have said and done in recent weeks.

## WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The crucial question is: where does this leave us now? Numerous people, including representatives of the national press, have asked me recently: do recent developments within the National Front portend the possibility of a reconciliation between the two factions into which it became divided in 1980? I would very much like to give an affirmative answer to that question but I believe that to do so at this stage might be over-optimistic.

Among rational men and women, the resolution of a dispute by one side being proved overwhelmingly right in that dispute would seem to be a natural outcome. There is no crime or disgrace in having made mistakes; we all have made them in the course of politics, I included. The test of our character comes when, confronted with decisive evidence of our mistakes, we are faced with the duty to acknowledge them and recognise the superior judgement of those who attempted in the first place to dissuade us from the ill-chosen path which we followed. People of big and mature character are not above such a humble and conciliatory gesture; only vindictive and little people with small minds and smaller spirits find that gesture more than they can endure. Such people hate you for being right even more intensely than they could ever hate you for being wrong, and your own vindication in the quarrel serves in their case, not to terminate, but only to add greater bitterness to that quarrel.

Exactly how those who became divided from us in 1980 will react to the evidence of the wrongness of their own position and the rightness of ours remains yet to be seen. I can only say that our door to them is open and that my colleagues and I are available for discussion with them at any time. This

*Contd. overleaf*



## WE WERE RIGHT!

(Contd. from prev. page)

was the position in early 1982, when we circularised them with the proposal that all factions into which the Nationalist cause had been divided meet and attempt to sort out their differences with a view to the formation once again of a single unified Nationalist party. On that occasion they slammed the door shut and bitterly attacked us for what we were attempting to do. If there is to be a reopening of the lines of communication between them and us, we feel in the circumstances that it is for them to initiate it, but if they do they will not find us wanting to slight or humiliate them; many talents are needed in the building of a reunified and revived Nationalist movement and we do not claim to have a monopoly of all those talents but acknowledge that there are some in which their side may exceed our side.

## DIVISIVE PEOPLE

What leads me to some caution in judging whether such a reconciliation is possible is my knowledge of some of the personalities present in their camp and the absolute determination of these people to perpetuate the divisions that have arisen between us. I am not necessarily assured that this determination has been lessened by recent shafts of light that have been cast on the situation.

I hear much talk of "ideological division" and even those who in their recent circular admitted the Front's political regression nevertheless felt able in the same breath to speak of its "ideological advance". I am not sure quite what an "ideological advance" is — perhaps someone may tell me! I only know that in the days when I led the National Front ideological divisions were not a problem, at least to the point of causing any serious internal warfare. We certainly embraced some variety of views on a number of political, economic and social issues subsidiary to the issue of national and racial survival, and some arguments on these subsidiary questions occasionally occurred. There was, however, an overriding consensus mature enough to relegate these arguments to their proper position of proportion and to recognise the overwhelming priority of Nationalists working together. These ideological divisions of which some people speak seem to have been introduced only since the split of 1980 and there is the distinct impression that they are more of a manufactured pretext for keeping the separate factions apart than any genuine cause for fragmentation. I would counsel the strongest suspicion of those who speak the language of ideological division the most loudly, for behind their rhetoric there are usually deeper causes of their divisive behaviour. Most factional conflicts between people belonging to the same broad political spectrum arise less out of real differences of conviction than from struggles for power. I

was made acutely aware of this in the factional struggle occurring in the National Front in 1974-76 and to which I have referred: the side opposed to us trumpeted to everyone that they stood for 'democratic Nationalism' as opposed to the 'authoritarian' and 'undemocratic' version which they associated with our side. Yet they threw their supposed 'democratic' principles out of the window in their final attempt to defeat us when their leader defied a majority decision of the Directorate on a disciplinary dispute and arbitrarily 'expelled' from the party all those who had the temerity to vote against him — necessitating bringing him before a court of law to get this decision reversed! No, these professed divisions of 'ideology' usually amount to the purest humbug, cloaking the designs of those who simply want power against those they see as their rivals for power.

If this fact of political life can be seen clearly by a substantial number of those who have been divided from us over the past 4 years, and if they have the good grace to recognise that recent events and decisions inside their own organisation have 90 per cent resolved the differences which first tore us apart 4 years ago, there is a chance of the reconciliation that all sensible Nationalists want to see. As to whether they will see these things, I cannot make any certain prediction at the present time. I can only say again that our door is open — at least to all these who, whatever their past errors, truly have the cause of Britain at heart.

# STRANGER THAN FICTION

ONE SUNDAY quite recently, I was having my customary lunch time pint in the local when an old friend came up to me and asked my opinion about the shooting down of the South Korean airliner by the Russians. I replied: "We can't pass judgment until we know all the facts, but it wouldn't surprise me if the aircraft had been on a spying mission." My friend looked at me incredulously and said: "I'll never believe that any responsible government would ever risk the lives of 269 people like that." He then changed the subject.

Later that day I began thinking about some incidents that have occurred during the last 70 years or so which, due to the connivance of governments, have resulted in the deaths of many times the number of those who perished on the Korean aircraft, incidents which have never been satisfactorily explained and often seem stranger than fiction.

For instance, there was the sinking of the *Lusitania* off the Irish coast in May 1915 in which 1,201 people perished. Having read numerous books and other literature about the *Lusitania* tragedy I, like many others, am convinced that the ship was a floating arsenal

## Russia's shooting down of a Korean airliner reminds CHARLES BROOKS of some earlier unexplained events

that carried passengers simply to camouflage the real nature of her mission. There is ample evidence for believing that on her last voyage she was carrying not only ammunition but also Canadian troops destined for the Western Front, which obviously made her a legitimate target for attack.

The *Lusitania's* owners (Cunard) and the British Government must have known what she was being used for and the possible consequences, and the Admiralty certainly knew that German U-boats were operating in the area where she was sunk — indeed, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, had been specifically warned of the danger to the ship. Yet despite all these factors the voyage was allowed to go ahead;

while at the time of the sinking the Admiralty Operations Room was inexplicably closed and Churchill was conveniently visiting the troops in France. Why was the official attitude concerning the safety of the *Lusitania* so woefully lax? Could it be that the Government hoped that if she were sunk the deaths of the large number of American passengers on board would induce the American Government to enter the war on the side of the Allied Powers?

## LENIN

Another strange event occurred in 1917. Two Russian revolutionaries, Lenin and Trotsky, with the connivance of the Allied Powers, were allowed to enter Russia for the purpose of fomenting an uprising in that country, with the inevitable result that the Russian war effort collapsed. This enabled the Germans to transfer their troops engaged in fighting the Russians to the Western Front, thus causing the deaths of millions of Allied troops in the trenches of France and Flanders,

Contd. on next page



as well as prolonging the war.

That the Allies could not have foreseen the consequences of Russia's withdrawal from the war is beyond belief. I can only conclude that either the Allied leaders were incompetent or treasonable, probably both. Six months earlier, one man who did appreciate the importance of the Russians to the war effort of Britain and her Allies, Field Marshal Lord Kitchener, determined to go to Russia in an endeavour to bolster up the morale of the Russian High Command and to find out for himself what the Russians required in the way of military assistance in order to keep up the war effort against Germany — which, had it been forthcoming, would probably have averted the Revolution — but the warship carrying Lord Kitchener across the North Sea, the *HMS Hampshire*, unfortunately "struck a mine" and sank with the loss of all hands.

There are some very curious aspects concerning the departure of the ill-fated *Hampshire*. The night that she was due to set sail there was a severe storm blowing and the Captain asked permission for the voyage to be postponed until it had abated, but this was refused by the Admiralty. Even stranger is the convenient reason that the Prime Minister, Herbert Asquith, found for cancelling the plan for the Minister of Munitions, Lloyd George, to accompany Kitchener to Russia. A few hours before the departure Lloyd George received the following letter from Asquith:

**SECRET**

10 Downing Street,  
Whitehall, SW.  
22nd May 1916.

My dear Lloyd George,

I hope you may see your way to take up Ireland; at any rate for a short time. It is a **unique** opportunity and there is no one else who could do so



**THE FAMOUS KITCHENER POSTER**  
His death was an unsolved mystery



**LUSITANIA ABOUT TO SINK**  
Was its destruction contrived?

much to bring about a permanent solution.

Yours very sincerely,  
**H. H. ASQUITH.**

Can anyone possibly believe that a few hours' delay in the departure of the *Hampshire* would have made any significant difference to the turn of events in Russia, or that only Lloyd George could have dealt with matters arising in Ireland? It all seems highly suspicious to me.

## PLANNED

Franklin D. Roosevelt once remarked that "There are no coincidences in politics; if something happens you can bet someone planned it that way." If he is right then the crew of the *Hampshire* were in all probability sacrificed in an attempt to prevent Kitchener visiting Russia. And mention of Roosevelt reminds me of yet another avoidable event that resulted in a massive loss of life — Pearl Harbour. It is now well known that Roosevelt wanted to take the US into World War II, despite his election promise that America would not send her "boys" to fight in another European war. Although Roosevelt and his Government were well aware that the Japanese had plans to attack Pearl Harbour, they did nothing to prevent the attack or to alert the army and naval commanders at Pearl Harbour. The result was

that some 3,000 American servicemen lost their lives, several warships were sunk and countless aircraft were destroyed. But American public opinion was so enraged that Roosevelt had little difficulty taking his country into the European war on the side of the Allies — an outcome that he and Churchill had been assiduously planning for well over a year.

Before I return to the shooting down of the Korean airliner, I would like to remind readers of an event which took place in what was then called Rhodesia only a few years ago. A Viscount airliner was shot down by Mr. Joshua Nkomo's terrorists, who then cold-bloodedly butchered the survivors; but compared with the outcry caused by the fate of the Korean aircraft scarcely a murmur was heard. Indeed, only a few weeks later Prime Minister Jim Callaghan and Foreign Secretary David Owen visited Nkomo to apologise because some British companies had breached trade sanctions against South Africa.

So I expect that all that will happen to the Russians for shooting down the Korean airliner is that a committee of enquiry will be set up by the United Nations which, not wishing to offend Russia, will issue a mealy-mouthed statement that blames no one. And then the whole sordid business will be conveniently forgotten — except by the relatives and dependants of the victims. Such is the way of liberal democracy.



ONE OF the most frequently misused "cult words" in modern political parlance is the word "democracy". It is used unctuously by unscrupulous trade union leaders, left-wing militants and opportunist politicians, with an appearance of reverence, which the Ancient Greeks reserved only for their gods or when invoking the Oracle at Delphi.

If asked what is meant by "democracy", the devotee might quote the claptrap of the well-worn constitutional cliché, "Government of the people, by the people and for the people." He might even add, if he were in a gratuitous mood, that it also includes: freedom of expression; the right of peaceful assembly; equality before the law and the right of self-determination of nations. If asked to quote an example of democracy at work he is then faced with an extensive choice. He could opt for Mr. Ronald Reagan's brand of All-American, homespun democracy with its intimidating "cordon sanitaire" of military bases, menacing those countries whose own version of "democracy" the American President does not like. It would appear that this unique type of American "democracy" allows for the expression of threatening, international military stances, without any consultation with your allies, but which could lead them to be involved in a major nuclear confrontation. A recent symptom of American "democracy" is a willingness to invade small, independent countries, particularly those whose Head of State is the Sovereign of a major ally. The presidential norm in American "democracy" is self-righteous moralisation whilst presiding over a drug-ridden society with plummeting moral standards, which has exported its debasing sub-culture to most parts of the world.

## LITTLE PRETENCE IN RUSSIA

Our devotee, of course, might quote the other super power, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. At least here there is little pretence. A one-party monolithic state, tyrannical in structure, historically fratricidal and suffering from social petrification between the constraints of bureaucracy and insularity. A state which having cast off the Romanovs retained their expansionist and imperialist ambitions under the guise of socialist internationalism. A country whose only notable export has been the class struggle, causing hatred and death between people of the same blood. Russia and the United States of America both suffer from an ego-centric tunnel vision which rejects the interests of the wider spectrum of humanity and therein lies their homicidal compatability.

What of Britain, the alleged "home of modern democracy" and what of Ancient Greece, the putative "cradle of democracy"? If one takes the proponents in chronological sequence one is rapidly convinced that even though "democracy", as we know it, was certainly not conceived in Ancient Greece, the "democratic charade" was counterfeited

# THE CHARADE OF 'DEMOCRACY'

AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS BY  
**STANLEY CLAYTON-GARNETT**

and posthumously attributed to the classical Greek philosophers.

Athens, it has been said, was governed by public meeting; from which leaders emerged, and though this statement oversimplifies the matter, it serves to throw into relief the difference between a city democracy and the democracies of our own time. One of the greatest leaders to emerge was Pericles, who in his famous speech about Athens, reported by the historian Thucydides said:—

"Our form of government does not enter into rivalry with the institutions of others. We do not copy our neighbours, but we are an example to them. It is true that we are called a democracy, but while the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognised. For we have compelled every land and every sea to open a path for our valour and have everywhere planted eternal memorials of our friendship and our enmity."

The Periclean form of democracy would appear to have very little to do with the views of the "populist democrats" of our own time; indeed there are strong overtones of a philosophy to which we British Nationalists could subscribe. Our democratic devotee could argue that the statesman-orator Pericles was merely expressing his own point of view. However, Plato and Aristotle, the founders

of the schools of Dialectic Philosophy and Logic, both believed that Democracy was second only to Tyranny as the worst of political evils. In the dialogues contained in *The Republic* Plato makes the following observations:—

"Then these things and others of a like kind will be the marks of democracy. It will be, apparently a pleasant constitution, with no rulers and plenty of variety, distributing its peculiar kind of equality to equals and unequals impartially. Then think of the considerateness of the city, its entire concern with trifles, its disregard for all of those things we spoke of so proudly when we were founding our city; we said that no-one could turn out a good man unless his earliest years were given to noble games, and he gave himself to noble pursuits. Is it not sublime how this democratic city tramples all such things under foot and is indifferent as to what life a man had before he entered politics. Under this constitution the condemned criminals when they have been sentenced to death or exile let it make no difference, but stay on and wander about the streets and no-one pays any attention. To the democratic city corresponds the democratic man. He has been brought up by his father in an uncultured and niggardly atmosphere and has rebelled against it."


Plato was a master of irony and his reference to the decadence of the then Athenian scene following the eclipse of Pericles might well refer to our own contemporary society. Plato's view of democracy was a reflection of the views, not only of Aristotle, but of Socrates and Aristophanes, and of most of the post-Periclean school of philosophers.

If I have created perplexity by researching the alleged origins of democracy I have done so with the object of stating a case which discredits the alleged historical sources upon which the credibility of our modern, permissive democrats depend. They seek support, not from the Glorious Greece of Pericles, but from a permissive decadent society in decline, which justly earned the contempt of the world's greatest philosophers. It is that decadence with which our modern democrats have sullied our contemporary social organisms. We have discovered the truth about "democracy" in Ancient Greece so I now turn to its alleged offspring, "democratic" Britain.

## CONTROLLED BY FINANCE

Britain is a country whose economy is controlled by international speculative finance. This funding of our national enter-

*Contd. on next page*



**PLATO**

Saw through the facade



prise is not based upon the nation's needs but upon the maximisation of profit for the financiers and the accrued influence which they achieve over the British economy and subsequently over government policy. International speculative finance is predominantly, in the politically intrusive sense, an international Jewish operation. The communications media: press, radio, television and the cinema have a similar preponderance of Jewish influence. One of the results of this influence over the economy and the media is the disproportionate number of Jews in leadership roles in the two major Establishment political parties. Indeed a Cabinet meeting of the present government could easily be mistaken for a meeting of the Jewish Board of Deputies.

How have the Jews achieved so much overt and covert power in so many countries? The easy answer is that they have placed profit and influence before service and self-sacrifice, living as the cuckoo in the host bird's nest, nudging and pushing until the host bird is evicted. It is important, however, to seek for the deeper historical truths, because they are related to the fraudulent foundation of the "democratic charade". The Jews following the Diaspora concentrated upon finance as an international means of fulfilling religious and racial objectives, based upon the Jewish-inspired allegory that they were "God's chosen people". The other thrust of the Jews was the using of Communism as a vehicle for their aspirations, disguised as the antithesis of capitalism. It is a truism that the Jews are only internationalist in the sense that they pursue narrow, tribal objectives at the expense of the international community, objectives which in recent times have resulted in two World Wars. Their alleged internationalism does not even extend to Pan-Semitism, for they wage a constant genocidal war against their Semitic brethren, the Palestinian Arabs.

## MEDIA - CONDITIONING

If one studies the politico-social environment of Britain, one can observe a pattern in the political stances acceptable to the Establishment. The communications media ensure that the ideas disseminated condition the social reflexes of the population. You may assemble and express your views, but only within the confines of the system. The "respectable" left may protest, agitate and demonstrate, but these are allowable peristaltic spasms, which take the heat out of the system and which permit the safe-channelling of non-conformity. The lunatic left is allowed its cerebral brand of expression, as a means of alarming the population and driving them further into conformity. A slight variation upon the set theme is tolerated, such as the mis-begotten offspring of the Labour Party, the SDP, with its talk of "breaking the mould" when it is merely



PERICLES

Little in common with present 'democrats'

the crematorium of dead political ambitions and a refuge for the a-political. What of a party that strives for an iconoclastic solution, a party such as the BNP, which does not deal in cosmetic policies but which seeks a new and radical political dimension leading to our national renaissance? Smears and vilification from the orchestrated press, deprivation of the right of peaceful assembly in public halls, by those town hall Establishment lackeys, the so-called "elected representatives"; and, if our resolve is still strong, the media-inspired assault by the moronic mobsters of the cerebral left.

Where are those "democratic" principles for which the Establishmentarians produced the carnage of two World Wars? Where is the nobly proclaimed but spurious Hellenic tradition? It is a charade, one of the many opiates peddled to keep the people sedated and in a condition to accept the unacceptable. I would ask you: were not Plato and Aristotle right in their contempt for Democracy?

The fundamental inexactitude of Democracy is that all men are equal when it is evident that all men are different. It was recognised in the Scriptures that there were those who were "carriers of pitchers and hewers of wood"; this was not a mark of inferiority but an indication that men were different in the skills and talents which they were able to contribute to society. Nationalism recognises and esteems this difference and knows that this God-given permutation of skills enriches and makes effective the life of the corporate National State. Man is happy when he is following a fulfilling role commensurate with his ability and by so doing avoiding the "square peg in the round hole" syndrome. Pericles understood this; he did not simulate a belief that all men had the

gift of political perception, anymore than that all men with political perception had craft, artistic or musical talents. He subscribed to the idea that we meet and leaders emerge. It is, in anthropological terms, a process of natural selection which is consistent with the "folk need" to build upon the strengths of its people.

## ORIGIN OF GREAT LEADERS

The world's great leaders did not emerge as the result of a loaded franchise or back-room trades off. They did not sell their political soul to the Semiticised Establishment, but they emerged as the result of consensus and the "Triumph of Will". The will of the people was reflected in the emergence of Alexander the Great, Constantine and in later times Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, Salazar, Jose Antonio de Riviera and Juan Peron. All these leaders came from the people and existed by the people, but they exercised executive power absolutely, in the service of their nations and peoples. Offices were delegated by the Leader, and the administrative structure demonstrated the strength, integrity and corporate quality of the Leader's perception. I am sure that the prime political objective of our movement in power will be to remove the sinister influence of those "maggots of corruption" which through social debasement and financial manipulation frustrates our national resurgence and attempts by genetic pollution to eliminate our racial identity. We must establish a corporate state, purged of the charade of "populist democracy" and committed to responsibility and accountability through a constitution based upon the leadership principle, related to service to the State, by each citizen according to his talents and ability.

Others have travelled this way before. They did not fail for we live by their example. We have now taken their torch for the fulfilment of our national destiny.

*Build it again,  
Great child of the Earth,  
Build it again,  
With a finer worth.  
In thine own bosom build it on high!  
Take up thy life once more:  
Run the race again!  
High and clear  
Let a lovelier strain,  
Ring out than ever before!*

JOHANN VON GOETHE

The Editor and Mrs. Tyndall take this opportunity to convey their sincerest thanks to all those readers and supporters who sent them greetings cards at Christmas. Mr. and Mrs. Tyndall hope that all those concerned will understand that it has not been possible to send reciprocal cards or individual acknowledgements in all cases.



377 082  
"Where the Greeks had modesty, we have cant; where they had poetry we have cant; where they had patriotism, we have cant; where they had anything that exalts, delights or adorns humanity we have nothing but cant, cant, cant." T. L. PEACOCK

AS A PEOPLE we are notorious for our addiction to cant and hypocrisy. Indeed, it is difficult to think of even one aspect of our national life not dominated by cant. This would perhaps not matter too much were it not for our habit of acting and legislating as if the cant were true. This is not only stupid but appallingly costly.

Let us consider one aspect of one universally accepted piece of cant: that "human life is sacred." But sacred to whom or to what? We are never told whom or what, merely that it is "sacred". This is indeed a curious statement to make in what is virtually a pagan country. But when we are told that human life is sacred we do not do as we should and burst into roars of laughter. We nod solemnly and agree, and under the influence of this piece of cant decide to abolish the death penalty. As a result of paying lip service to cant, we are committed to finding for ever enormous sums of money to keep confined people who on any impersonal assessment of their worth to society are better dead.

For instance, a multiple killer — being held to be human and therefore sacred, even if insane — may not be eliminated as reason, logic and the well-being of society dictate. Instead he is sentenced to be imprisoned for, say, 25 years. Let us do a little simple arithmetic and see what it will cost us to go along with this piece of cant.

## KEEPING A KILLER

We were told recently, in an article in *The Economist*, that it costs £11,500 a year to keep a man in a maximum security prison. Thus, over 25 years he will cost society, that is you and I, the sum of £287,500. Multiply that figure by the number of killers who, but for a sickly squeamishness and the power of cant, would be executed and the figure becomes astronomical. It is futile to argue that the State is paying; the State, as the State, has no money. It gets its money from the taxpayers. This means that each sacred human being sentenced to 25 years in prison when he should be executed costs us, not the State, £287,500. This is not the whole story, of course. If he has a family, that family will be supported by the State while he is in prison. Further, on his release he is unlikely to find employment, so he will have to be supported by the State. Why will he "have" to be supported? Because cant says so.

The average national income is given as £7,000. On this £1,350 is normally payable as Income Tax. Had our notional killer been an average earner who paid his Income Tax for 25 years he would have contributed

# THE HIGH COST OF CANT

£33,750. It costs us far more to keep him alive in gaol than he would have paid in taxes had he been free. As a prisoner of course he pays no taxes. Yet the costs of his confinement must be met. So some law-abiding citizens will have the whole of their tax payments for 25 years swallowed up to keep imprisoned one completely useless human being. It doesn't make sense.

Millions of voters and taxpayers disagree with the cant that says that human life is sacred. They do not agree that a murderer's humanity makes him sacred, no matter what cant may say. In fact they think that such a

---

by  
**NOEL A. HUNT**

---

man is not sacred but an expensive nuisance. One can bear an expense; one can tolerate a nuisance; but an expensive nuisance . . . That is too much. Yet so tight is the grip of cant on the liberal consensus which rules us that the views of these millions of people are, and will continue to be, ignored. The bulk of the electorate, who elect the governments and pay the taxes, accept this situation uncom-

plainingly. What a wonderful thing is cant! It can make a man behave as if what he knows to be untrue were the truth, and it can make him act against his own interests.

## COMMON SENSE

If cant could once be seen for what it is, not a revelation from on high but merely part of the droolings of the humanist, we would suddenly be able to think in terms of common sense, the interests of society and our own interests as taxpayers.

For instance, once free from cant we can see clearly that any man who has, say, three previous convictions for burglary or aggravated assault is most unlikely to mend his ways, no matter what the social scientist may tell us. He is likely to continue cracking cribs and ribs and being an expensive nuisance for the rest of his life, in spite of the special pleading of the penologist. Why should the law-abiding taxpayer be compelled to meet the enormous cost of keeping such a man confined? Why should not the prosecutor, as a representative of the taxpayer, be entitled to argue, when sentence is being considered, that the accused has already cost the taxpayer enough and that the death penalty is now in order? This approach has the immense advantage that one is not putting forward a moral argument, or arguing in terms of deterrence; one is merely arguing that X is taking out of society more than he is putting in and that this must stop. It is difficult indeed to see why society should not be able to decide that such a man is more trouble and expense than he is worth, and eliminate him.

There is one very good reason why society cannot, of course. It is called cant. As Carlyle put it: "Till cant cease, nothing else can begin."

## RACIAL ATTACK

TV and the press are full of regular weepings and wailings about 'racial attacks' on coloured immigrants but never say anything about attacks on Whites.

Such as the one made by a gang of 25 West Indian youths on two 19-year-olds in Wolverhampton earlier this month. After the attacks the two, Troy Blakeway and Bryon Johnson, needed more than 100 stitches in stab wounds.

Needless to say, this vicious attack was only mentioned in the local press.



**THE YORKSHIRE RIPPER**  
Being kept comfortably for the rest of his life  
at the taxpayer's expense



TORY ECONOMIC ORTHODOXY maintains that British industries are failing because they are inefficient and unprofitable. We should not protect them from foreign competition, the doctrine goes, because that would be to protect their inefficiency and unprofitability; on the contrary, foreign competition which ruins home industries should be welcomed as a correct manifestation of the working of 'market forces', which, if allowed to operate freely, will stimulate British industry to become more competitive.

It is in service to this doctrine that Britain now has about 3¼ million unemployed.

The doctrine, like all really dangerous ones, contains an element of half truth. There are a great number of British industries which are operating at low standards of quality and productivity. Competition is certainly one spur towards an improvement in such standards. But it is only one; to say that greater competition is the elixir which will automatically rejuvenate run-down industries and place them in the highest league of efficiency is a gross over-simplification of the matter. If the motor industry be taken as one example, years of intense foreign competition in the British market did not itself provide the cure for the depressing inefficiency and unprofitability of British Leyland but only further compounded the British car giant's problems by diminishing its resources for investment and modernisation. Leyland only began to improve its performance when there was a big shake-up in management and a strengthening of the determination to deal firmly with union militants. The initiatives taken here were largely initiatives taken by the State, in keeping with the latter's role as the main Leyland shareholder. Market forces and the workings of private capital had very little to do with it.

## JAPANESE EXAMPLE

The Japanese motor industry, which by common consent is by far the most competitive in the world, is not forced to experience more than the minutest foreign competition in the Japanese home market; it has achieved its competitiveness under the stimulus of totally different factors. One of these has indeed been a state paternalism which has protected the industry *de facto* by the imposition of a multitude of bureaucratic barriers against imports, and thus enabled such firms as Toyota and Nissan to make vast profits out of sales to the Japanese home market, which have in turn been ploughed back into modernisation which has boosted export performance. The State again has taken the initiative by a programme of public education which has ensured an endless flow of capable young technicians into this and other Japanese industries and, at the same time it has created a machinery and climate of industrial relations in which teamwork between management and the

# Save British Aerospace!

## HOW TORY POLICIES ARE DESTROYING A HIGHLY EFFICIENT INDUSTRY

shop floor is of immeasurably higher order than in this country.

We should now examine the case of another British industry which exposes as sheer humbug the Tory claim that its policy is to encourage those home industries that are efficient and profitable. It also demolishes another Tory dogma by showing that industries can be just those things while being publicly owned.

The case is that of British Aerospace. This has up to recently been a nationalised industry. It is also a highly successful one. It possesses the most highly skilled work force



THE A320 AIRBUS

in the world. It is the most profitable industry of its kind outside the USA — where the huge domestic market for aerospace products makes comparisons of profitability largely invalid.

Yet now British Aerospace is in grave danger of losing that position.

It is in that danger solely because of lack of adequate government support. The Government's policy has been to buy American in preference to high quality British or partly British products. In 1981 the Government bought on behalf of the RAF the American version of a British invention, the Harrier jump-jet, despite the offer by British Aerospace of a plane which in this regard met all the RAF's needs.

Then the Government decided to lease Boeings from the Americans for British Airways in preference to supporting the A320

Airbus, a European project in which Britain has a 20 per-cent share. We believe that the Airbus is a second best alternative to an all-British aircraft, but since the Government has decided against the latter it is certainly preferable to the policy of going for an American product. Support for the Airbus will at least make possible the preservation of thousands of jobs in British Aerospace; the American arrangement will mean the loss of most of those jobs.

And this will mean the loss of our skilled workers too, for these will probably emigrate to somewhere where their skills are appreciated and used.

In 1982-83 5,200 were laid off by British Aerospace. Unless the Government supports the Airbus in preference to leasing Boeings, it is estimated that 9,000 more jobs will be at risk.

## POINTLESS

In 1981 the Government decided to de-nationalise British Aerospace. If the industry had been working badly there might have been some merit in this. But it was not working badly, having just boosted its profits over the previous year by £396 million and its exports by 40 per-cent. 'Even the employers' organisation, the Society of British Aerospace Companies, thought this a retrograde step. "It rocked the boat," they said, "just when the system was working well."

But Tory dogma had to be satisfied. The danger is now that the de-nationalised parts of the industry will be bought up by foreign companies, and decisions affecting the jobs of thousands of our most skilled workers will be made abroad.

This Tory Government is in fact systematically killing off a great British enterprise — an enterprise which has proved it can hold its own with the very best.

If that enterprise dies, it will not be because of lack of efficiency or profitability; it will be because of unpatriotic government policy.

There are many industries which come into the same category. We have cited British Aerospace as just one. The British Aerospace story is a perfect example of the need for a policy of Economic Nationalism. Let us not forget it.



# THE BATTLE AT HOME

*Reproduced with acknowledgements to  
INSTAURATION, Box 76, Cape Canaveral,  
Florida 32920, U.S.A.*

The purpose of *Instauration* is to change opinion by revealing so much that has been concealed. Inevitably, this is a long-term project, and awakened members of the Majority may be excused for regarding it as a cowardly alternative to immediate action. The trouble with immediate action is that it is most unlikely to be successful at this stage -- the relatively small numbers of those committed to our survival, and the wall of misrepresentation which surrounds them, make it easy to isolate them. That is why those who favour immediate action are usually people with little to lose. We all admire the man who dares to be a Daniel and sympathise with Sir Henry Wotton's seventeenth-century picture of the ideal yeoman:

*How happily is he born and taught  
That serveth not another's will,  
Whose armour is his honest thought,  
And simple truth his utmost skill.*

But Wotton himself was no yeoman. He was a subtle ambassador, who defined himself as "an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country." The uncomfortable truth is that prudence and foresight are evolutionary characteristics, and those who lack them soon find themselves in difficulties. *Suggestio falsi* is to be avoided, because it undermines the self-confidence of its practitioners, but *suppressio veri* may occasionally be a condition of survival.

Am I therefore arguing for inaction? Far from it. Nor am I saying that the self-sacrifice of those who come out into the open is by any means wasted. The power of example is very great, though it is most unlikely at this stage to be decisive. What I am saying is that we can radically reshape our societies by the way in which we live, and that we can best appeal to the very silent majority by demonstrating that common sense and the need for survival dictate action against the very real threat of replacement by the minorities. Once we get this message across, I guarantee there will be enough action to satisfy the most committed activist. The greatest danger is that Majority anger will be frustrated through redirection into another pointless war.

Our cause may be furthered through the existence of secret groups among ourselves, but my experience of such groups is that in so far as they become effective they cease to be secret. As Sir Oswald Mosley used to say, it is a rare man that can keep a secret from his own wife. On the other hand, dedication to an idea automatically creates the likelihood of cooperation among its adherents. This, rather than any system of signs and passwords, is what matters.

Both in the propagation of our point of view and in our

daily lives, I think that negative rather than positive selection should be our watchword. In winning over the fence-sitters, we should stress the obvious defects of our enemies and the threat to our survival rather than the virtues of a hypothetical future society. Listening enraptured to *Parsifal*, letting the overwhelming *Zukunftsmusik* wash over one like a tidal wave, as the hero does in Simon Gray's *Otherwise Engaged*, is all very well, but not likely to win over any of the ghastly people who interrupt him one after another. At the end of the play, he and his best friend do drown themselves in *Parsifal* once more, just as we shall be able to when we have transformed massive Majority inertia into momentum. Meanwhile, a new society can most easily emerge by way of reaction to what we see around us, and we can leave the manufacture of blueprints to those with the time and talent for such things.

But there is one highly effective way of maintaining one's sanity and improving one's prospects: eliminate as many problem-makers as possible from one's immediate circle. We have a special duty towards problem-makers within our families, and are usually in a position to modify, if not alter, their behaviour. For example, I have made it crystal clear that no son of mine is going to inherit anything from me, or even continue to enjoy my hospitality if he marries a half-breed of any kind. Women find it very difficult, if not impossible, to lay down the law in this way, but they feel grateful towards men who can. We have no defectives in our family, thank heaven (unless you can count one of my uncles, who was very brave but rather eccentric), but if we had it would be our duty to take discreet care of them by institutionalising anyone whose presence would be an intolerable burden on other members of the family. Far too many women try to deal with such problems by shifting the burden onto outsiders. However, the woman who ruined our garden party by inflicting her noisy mongoloid sister-in-law on us will not be invited again.

We also have a duty towards old folk who have fought the good fight and towards the children of our relations. I personally enjoy teaching my eleven-year-old nephew mathematical tricks or playing the Hobbit video game with him on Sinclair's little Spectrum computer. Outside the family we have our duties, too, though it is wholly wrong that our war wounded should be dependent on private charity while useless minority mouths are the recipients of public largesse. We also have an inner need to help anyone who looks right. But the emphasis should be on kindness to the deserving, not on that universalist benevolence which creates many more problems than it solves. The first step toward mental health is to eliminate all subscriptions to

*Contd. on next page*





societies seeking to improve the chances of procreation for genetic defectives of any kind. Muddying the gene pool is the ultimate sin.

The most difficult problem of all is what to do about teenagers. The answer is to keep them working and playing as hard as possible, and to take the trouble to ensure that they meet suitable members of the opposite sex. I know that this is rather like mixing carbon, saltpetre and sulphur. Someone only has to apply a match, and boom! Consider, however, the frightful consequences of letting things drift, giving the media and the educational system carte blanche to brainwash our youth. In my house there is no pop music whatsoever, and I find that a formal dance, with the Dashing White Sergeant, Strip the Willow and an eightsome reel gives teenagers a great deal more to remember.

There should also be some hypocrisy about sex -- implying that it doesn't happen, even though one can be pretty sure that sooner or later it will. It is no part of my plan to turn my house into a high-class bordello. Besides, teenage boys should be told that it is genetically unhealthy for them to sire children, and teenage girls should have their attention drawn to the awful consequences of bearing children out of wedlock. I know that I sound like a naughty old pander, but just consider the alternative -- some sleazy tart moving in with my son and refusing to leave. You should see the frowsy floozies who come openly into the great halls of Oxford colleges to have breakfast with their hosts: Chinese, Negresses, Eurasians, and grotty, bespectacled schoolteachers from South Wales.

The question of dealing with aliens is a tricky one for those who work with Jews, sell to coloureds or travel outside countries with populations of European origin. The important thing is to examine one's relationship with for-

eigners and restrict them to circumstances which are to our advantage, without of course betraying our own people in either word or deed.

I just don't have any Jewish friends. Experience has taught me that even the most open-minded Jews will go against me when the chips are down, and everything they know about me will then be used to my detriment. Nor do I even allow myself to enter into mutually profitable dealings with Jews, because of the unforgivable key part they have played in promoting the miscegenation of our society while maintaining their own exclusiveness. I have had many contacts of a commercial and cultural nature with non-Europeans, but have always found that goodwill is lessened rather than furthered by too much familiarity. They are very easily offended by our behaviour with intimates and very easily get hold of the wrong end of the stick where women are concerned. You may be sure that no rich young Middle Easterners have privileged access to the attractive young women of my tribe. Above all, I have no dealings with coloured immigrants, which I regard as a form of collaboration with the enemy. I do not wish to see them settle in comfortably at our expense, so I give them no useful information or help of any kind. If enough people followed my example and welfare were drastically cut, most immigrants would be anxious to emigrate to countries where their folk are in a majority. I also strongly disapprove of the upper-class custom of employing Filipino servants. Plenty of our people are willing to clean, wash and cook for us, if only this can be arranged without detriment to their financial position. What is the point of ensuring that the tax man takes a huge bite out of every transaction when one considers how the money is wasted

*Contd. on page 20*

## PUBLISHING DELAY

We regret the lateness of publication of this month's issue, which is due to factors beyond our control. We hope next month to have these problems straightened out and to be able to see the magazine out early in the month by about March or April.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.



# National Review

The League Review, a pro-National Socialist political journal published in Great Britain by the League of St. George.

**£5 for 6 issues, British Isles and overseas surface mail (US \$12)**

9/11 KENSINGTON HIGH ST.  
LONDON, W8 5NP

## How to obtain SPEARHEAD

*Spearhead* is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—

British Isles: £8.00 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £8.55 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £10.60 ☐

Unsealed air-mail Middle East: £11.50 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Canada, USA, South America and

Africa: £13.10 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £14.00 ☐


**Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency, an additional charge of £3 is required in the case of cheques and 50p in the case of banknotes, these going to pay banker's commission.**

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 40p ea.; 20-49 copies: 36p ea.; 50-99 copies: 30p ea.; 100-199 copies: 26p ea.; 200-400 copies: 22p ea.; 500 copies or over: 20p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.





SIR: So the people who have pretensions to 'leadership' as Directorate Members of the National Front have at last, in an act of sheer desperation, begun the process of ditching one of the main causes of the collapse of the NF by removing Martin Webster from their Executive Council and from other offices.

Let us all hope that his final parting from the wreckage of that once proud party will not be too long in coming and he can then experience first-hand the "political wilderness" that he foretold for so many others!

TERRY FITZ-GERALD  
London SE2

SIR: A news paragraph in the *Daily Telegraph* recently informed us that a Sikh teacher had been awarded £500 compensation by her employers, Avon Council, for injured feelings because a male colleague had called her a wog and a foreigner. The news item went on to say that the male colleague had admitted he was a racist (rather as if he had admitted he was guilty of a crime!) and that the local authority was trying to persuade him to attend a 'racist awareness' course. This course intrigues me. I imagine that it goes much further than its title would imply (surely we must all know whether we belong to that terrible genre a "racist"). I imagine that in reality this course is a blatantly brain-washing one. It would be interesting to know more about what goes on, and I would like to suggest that you commission someone who has attended such a course to write about it in *Spearhead*.

I have read somewhere that, since the Scarman Report, Hendon Police College now includes such courses in its training programme. Do you know any policeman who has had to undergo such an ordeal and would be willing to write about it (anonymously of course)?

As a retired local government officer, I should be interested to know what legal powers the Avon Council thinks it possesses which entitle it to award damages much as if it were a court of law. Furthermore, if the culprit had committed a "crime" by calling the Asian teacher a wog, he should pay the "fine". Why should the ratepayers have to foot the bill? I

think there is an opportunity here for some Party member living in the area to challenge with the District Auditor the expenditure of £500.

H. S. HALL  
Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk

SIR: Many of your readers must surely be wondering what will eventuate from this massive "over-loaning" with billions of dollars to already bankrupt countries by what have become known as the Megabanks.

Having read extensively of the methods employed by the so-called Banks to satisfy their endemic greed for more and more power, several facts come to my mind.

Firstly, we are surely not expected to believe that these people are motivated by any feeling of compassion for the failing economies of their debtors.

Secondly, we are told by their 'Kept' Press that these Megabanks are in serious financial trouble. Now let us not be hoodwinked into believing these excessively cunning operators have made a mistake.

Finally, referring to Sir Oswald Mosley's memoirs, *My Life*, the author contends that in future military forces will not be necessary to take over a foreign country; it can be done from within.

Between the years 1913 to 1945 these so-called Bankers have managed to extend their creation, Communism, half way across Europe. From their very successful financing of the Bolshevik revolution, through the period of the two European Wars, they have amassed enormous wealth, having financed both the victor and the vanquished.

It is my belief that this massive over-loaning is intended to open the Debtor countries to the establishment of vast industries, enjoying cheap slave labour, so to ensure vast profits creating, as in the case of Russia, small *élite* groups of their own choosing.

It has been reported that there are nearly as many millionaires in Soviet Russia as in the U.S.A.

O. G. ALLANSON-WINN  
George, CP, South Africa

SIR: R. Pennick (October *Spearhead*) was quite right in pointing out that Richard the Third was a Yorkist and not a Lancastrian, and I can assure readers that this was a mere slip of the pen. Otherwise I stand by the content of my article "Propaganda Masquerading As History".

It was the Yorkist cause that Shakespeare was seeking to discredit in his play Richard the Third on behalf of his political masters, the Tudors. He did it very well, too.

RAY HILL  
Leicester

SIR: I have noticed with great joy that over the last few months the anti-racist gutter rag *Searchlight* has become increasingly ineffective. Not only that, but it also portrays the BNP

as taking second place to the NF.

This is good news for two reasons: Firstly, it shows that we have successfully rooted out the grasses within our own movement and secondly that *Searchlight* feels bound to ignore our successes while highlighting NF achievements, recognising that it is the BNP that has emerged as Britain's premier Nationalist party and the one which they must stop.

For months now, *Searchlight* has lacked really hard news concerning us and concentrates on ridicule and on our party chairman and 'his dwindling band of supporters' - a palpable lie known to any one who attended our party rally in October. And what of that rally in *Searchlight*? Well, *Searchlight*, some 2 months behind in the news, describes this as 40 people who turned up spending the day on the London underground putting up Nazi stickers and mouthing abuse at passengers. The demise of *Searchlight* is almost too good to be true. *Searchlight* RIP.

A. WELLS  
Branch Organiser  
Redbridge

SIR: I fully agree with Stanley Clayton-Garnett's view that our children must be taught moral virtues. It would however, be most contradictory for us nationalists to advocate enlightenment in the Christian faith as a basis for morality.

Christianity is inextricably bound to the Marxist concept of universal equality and multi-racialism, which naturally promotes widespread miscegenation. In place of a Christian-based morality, more significance to the all important spiritual facet of the socio-nationalist philosophy could be emphasised.

L. A. KERNAGHAN  
Norwich

SIR: After the IRA bombings in London over the Christmas period, I was interested to see on television the illuminated advertisement in Times Square, New York, offering the season's greetings to Irish 'Prisoners of War'.

This is a status the IRA does not enjoy at present but I believe that it would be in the interest of the British people to grant it this status for the following reasons:

- 1) Prisoners of War do not have to be apprehended in any specific act of warfare. If members of an enemy force are within reach, they are liable to be captured and made prisoner.
- 2) The guilt of such prisoners does not have to be proved in any court of law. They are simply captured and locked away.
- 3) There is no definite term of imprisonment and no question of early release for good behaviour.
- 4) They remain prisoners until, at the earliest, the total cessation of all hostilities.

K. HENDERSON  
Rochdale, Lancs.



## THE COMMON MARKET AFTER ATHENS

# *Time for a British UDI*

THE BRITISH PEOPLE should welcome, rather than lament as the Government is doing, the fact that the recent EEC Summit conference in Athens broke up in a shambles.

The conference was arranged to sort out fundamental differences between the member nations over the community's financial system. As it ended, the differences were as great as ever. "Nothing has been settled; no decisions whatever have been taken," said Mrs. Thatcher in disappointment after three strenuous days of attempted bargaining.

Mrs. Thatcher herself had in fact been the prime mover in the effort to get the system changed. Britain and West Germany are the only net contributors to the EEC budget, all the other member countries taking out more than they put in. In the case of West Germany, her contributions are more than balanced by a huge trading surplus with the community, which currently comes to £5,130,000, and the Germans philosophically accept their budget payments as a worthwhile price to pay for this surplus. No such advantage, on the other hand, accrues to Britain, whose trade with the EEC runs at a net loss of £1,140,000 at the last reckoning. This loss would be much bigger still if it were not for our large oil exports to the Market, so that we can get a measure of the catastrophic effects of EEC membership on Britain's manufacturing industry.

The cost of the EEC budget is rocketing every year. Not only is there the need to meet the vast subsidies required for the absurd Common Agricultural Policy, now running at £11 billion a year, but there is the mounting price of the enormous Market bureaucracy, with its multiplicity of meddling departments and the huge tax-free perks given to Euro-MPs and other officials as a necessary means of retaining their loyalty in a cauldron of conflicting national interests. The share borne by Britain in providing for this budget, when considered beside the non-existent trading advantages which we derive from membership, is quite preposterous, and it is hardly surprising that there is acrimony between our own Government representatives and those of the other EEC states over the whole financial system by which the community is run.

### WE SAY: GET OUT

Where we differ from Mrs. Thatcher and the present Government, however, is in the fact that they seek to stay in the community in the hope of reforming it, while we believe that the only solution is for Britain to get out.

As we have indicated before in these columns, we can have no sympathy with



people who join a club knowing its rules to be unacceptable to their best interests and then, having got in, have a dickens of a row with the other members in an effort to get the rules changed.

The Common Market was formed to the blare of trumpets which claimed that it was going to put an end to hostilities between the nations of Europe. In fact it has only served over the past quarter of a century to keep these hostilities going. Britain, West Germany, France and the other member nations have different interests and different needs, which such an institution as the EEC simply cannot accommodate and cannot reconcile. It is time that it was scrapped.

This is not to say that there are not some areas over which there is an overall common interest between these nations; there are, but these areas are the very ones in which the Common Market has made no effort whatever to take action. If there is one overriding thing which binds the European states together it is the fact that they are the traditional homelands of the White Race. In that respect they are bound, not only to each other, but to all other communities of white racial settlement throughout the world, i.e. to North America, to Australasia and to Southern Africa. Some international institution which served to protect the true interests and security of the White Race as a whole would be an acceptable one, providing that it recognised the limits to which it could go in its interference in the internal and national policies of its member states and providing that it avoided the absurdity of trying to impose a uniform economic programme upon those member states.

If we speak of the White Race as a whole, we are of course speaking of an aggregation of population and territory so vast that centralisation on the EEC model would be quite impossible; agreed sub-divisions would be essential, and all past experience suggests

### START OF THE E.E.C.

Representatives of the original Six sign the Treaty of Rome in 1957. What they created has proved a gigantic failure, particularly for Britain since we joined in 1973.

that such sub-divisions would be more effective if conceived along ethnic lines, i.e. Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Gallic, Hispanic, Slav, etc., than along the lines of geography. This is why our magazine has always supported a reformed British Commonwealth of white member states as an alternative to the European Common Market. We have advocated this concept, not as a step back to the British Empire of Queen Victoria, but as a step forward to an Anglo-Saxon world community of the 21st Century of which it is not inconceivable that the United States may one day become a member in the event of the North European majority resuming its control over that country.

### NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

All this of course is futuristic thinking and dependent on vast political changes in many countries which at the present time exist only in the minds of a few visionaries without influence and without power. For the moment Britain's practical need is to get out of the EEC and opt for a policy of national independence based on a reliance on the resources of the United Kingdom alone. We should not underestimate these resources, as we have tended to do in recent times; potentially they are considerable, but they need a new order of political leadership and organisation for this potential to be realised. Without those things, we shall continue to drift along in weakness and impotence, no use to the White Race, no use to our old Commonwealth friends and no use to ourselves.



# Bradford schools campaign makes big impact

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY recently won huge local publicity in the Bradford area as a result of its involvement in a campaign to obtain segregated schools and to combat the large amount of anti-white multi-racialist propaganda now being put out in schools in the city.

Bradford is one of the worst examples of the failure of the multi-racial experiment in Britain. It has a very large immigrant (mainly Asian) population and some Bradford schools have become the scenes of serious racial disorder, notably Eccleshall Upper School and Wyke Middle School.


Education in the area, as almost everywhere, is dominated by leftish-inclined teachers and local education authority administrators, who have tolerated -- indeed positively encouraged -- coloured immigrant racism while refusing to tolerate any expression of white racial self-defence.

The BNP campaign has been dedicated to countering these tendencies and promoting the idea of school segregation -- pending of course a more permanent solution to the problem by means of the complete re-settlement of non-white ethnic groups overseas.

In the forefront of the BNP campaign is Stanley Clayton-Garnett, who as the ex-headmaster of Delf Hill Middle School in

Bradford, is well acquainted with the evil consequences of the city's multi-racial education policy. Mr. Clayton-Garnett's role in the campaign has attracted massive publicity in the local press, with the party winning front-page headlines in the main Bradford newspaper, the *Telegraph & Argus*, two days running. On one occasion when Mr. Clayton-Garnett and local BNP Organiser Gerry Robinson went to attend a press conference, a large left-wing mob staged a protest demonstration outside, resulting in yet more publicity. In addition to this, Mr. Clayton-Garnett has had interviews on local radio in Leeds, where he is BNP Branch Chairman, and with the *Times Educational Supplement*.

Following the publicity, Mr. Clayton-Garnett has received several messages from schoolteachers in the Bradford area indicating their wholehearted support but saying that they would immediately be sacked if they identified themselves and stood by him openly. The publicity has also resulted in many enquiries about the party from local school pupils and parents.



STANLEY CLAYTON-GARNETT

## BNP Recordings

### RALLY '82

Speeches from the BNP national rally in London on October 16th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'

Side 1: Speeches by Charles Parker and Ray Hill; Side 2: Speech by John Tyndall.

### VOICES OF NATIONALISM

Side 1: Recordings of speeches from the Nationalist Unity rally in London on September 5th 1981. Hear John Tyndall, Ray Hill, Kenneth McKilliam, Len Bearsford Walker and others. Side 2: Talk by John Tyndall on 'The coming British revolution'.

### TYNDALL SPEAKS I

Side 1: Talk on 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' (about the world-wide dispersal of the peoples of British stock); Side 2: Talk on 'Britain's economic crisis'.

### TYNDALL SPEAKS II

Side 1: Talk on 'The case for Nationalism' (the internationalist argument demolished); Side 2: Talk on 'Tragedy of the 20th Century' (analysis of the results of the Second World War).

These 4 sets of recordings are presented in cassette form and are available at £3.50 each (with 17p postage) from: BNP Recordings, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

## Paper sales boom in South West

The South West of England is fast becoming a boom area for the sales of BNP literature. A highly enthusiastic team of party activists is now conducting regular door-to-door sales of the party's paper *British Nationalist* in Plymouth and South East Cornwall. In the top picture here left-to-right are Colin Bradbury, David Cullingford and Dave Stentaford, three of the keenest sellers. In the bottom picture the three can be seen selling on the doorstep in one of the Plymouth suburbs.





# Greenwich

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF GREENWICH, famous for its Cutty Sark, its Observatory and its Royal Naval College, also contains one of the most active and dedicated local branches of the British National Party.


Like many BNP branches, Greenwich has its roots in the old National Front in the 1970s, in which party its activists were always in the forefront. When the old Front broke up in 1979/80 the Greenwich Branch crossed over en bloc to the New National Front and later became absorbed with the rest of the NNF units in the British National Party when the latter was formed in 1982.

At the 1983 General Election Greenwich Branch fielded 3 candidates — a consider-

able feat for a branch of its limited resources and one which it achieved through the sheer determination and hard work of a few dedicated activists. In the course of its election campaign the branch distributed some 30,000 election addresses and gave local TV and radio interviews which won much local publicity.

From the beginning of the 1980s the leading figure in Greenwich Branch has been the Organiser Terry Fitzgerald. Terry Fitzgerald is a 40-year-old fire and security officer. He previously served in the regular army for 12 years (1962/74) in Europe and the Far East with several spells of duty in Northern Ireland. He is married with 2 daughters and his wife Marion regularly helps him in branch duties. In the 1983 General Election his work output was prodigious, for not only did he supply the main drive behind the branch's election campaign in 3 constituencies but he also undertook a large amount of liaison work with other branches in the South and South West of England which played a large part in contributing to the party's achievement in fighting 54 seats nationwide.

Many good activists have helped Terry Fitzgerald in the work of building up Greenwich Branch but two in particular who deserve mention, apart from Mrs. Fitzgerald, are Paul Banks and Ian Dell, who



Terry Fitzgerald (Organiser)

have always been in the forefront of activity both in the Greenwich area and elsewhere.

The London area, which is still not yet the British National Party's most powerful stronghold, has much reason to be grateful to Greenwich Branch for being a bastion of party activity in the region. The latest report is that, as a result of recent activities and of the General Election in particular, there is a steady flow of new recruits into the branch which should help take some of the load of activity off the shoulders of the small hard core who have borne the brunt of branch work in the past. According to Terry Fitzgerald, the last branch meeting was the best attended ever, and that is a most encouraging sign.

## BRITISH NATIONALIST

Mr. Ronald Rickcord, Editor of the monthly BNP tabloid *British Nationalist*, has announced this month that he has been forced to resign the editorship of the paper on account of increased working commitments.

Plans are now underway to make alternative arrangements for the production of *British Nationalist*. It is possible, however, that these may take a month or two to become finalised, and in the meantime there may be a slight hold-up in the regularity of publication.

Mr. Rickcord is due a vote of thanks from all of us for the magnificent job he done on the paper since 1981.

## British Nationalist

You can obtain single copies of *British Nationalist* by paying a subscription of £3.40 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *British Nationalist* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:—

10 copies	£1.20	+ 32p post
25 copies	£2.70	+ 94p post
50 copies	£4.80	+ £1.57 post
100 copies	£8.40	+ £1.90 post
150 copies	£12.00	+ £2.10 post
200 copies	£15.00	+ £2.25 post
300 copies	£21.00	+ £2.55 post
400 copies	£26.40	+ £2.80 post
500 copies	£32.00	) Bulk rates
1,000 copies	£62.00	) by roadline

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please keep orders and enquiries for *British Nationalist* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

## PLEASE DONATE!

BECAUSE we of *Spearhead* speak our mind openly on the great issues of the day, without fear of what powerful interests we offend, our magazine is constantly short of money. We cannot persuade the large wholesale distributors to buy copies, and our income from advertising is tiny. We obtain distribution through postal subscriptions and by sales through the local branches of the British National Party, which we support. The revenue from these sources is nowhere near enough to enable us to meet our production costs at the present time.

This is why we urgently need regular donations from our readers and supporters — over and on top of what they pay for their copies. We hope that you will become one of these regular donors. Please send us what you can so that we can continue publishing our vital message.

We remind all those making donations that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to cut down on office work and postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation of receipt, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with their donation.

All contributions should be sent to *Spearhead*, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



## THE BATTLE AT HOME

(Contd. from page 15)

on a horde of uncivil servants, loafers and immigrants.

Then there is the whole range of useful contacts I have with artisans of all kinds: builders, bakers, butchers, plumbers, electricians and garage mechanics. Strangely enough, the class thing makes such relationships easier, because it makes it unnecessary to pretend we are all the same. On the other hand, we do have a common interest in surviving, and I don't forget to deliver that message. I do believe that an alliance of the problem-solvers, and the rejection of problem-makers, constitutes a most effective social and political idea. We must live what we are before we can act effectively. We must create the pools in which the revolutionary fish can swim.

Of course, it is a whole lot easier to maintain a clean system than to create one. The moment problem-makers realise that you are out to get rid of them, they cling like leeches, using every kind of moral blackmail, though this blackmail can only work through weaknesses in ourselves. Not everything can be achieved by just sliding away, and there are going to be some unpleasant interviews before you are home and dry. Even when firmly removed, the problem-makers will try to make a comeback, but by that time one has developed the diplomatic and undiplomatic skills necessary to keep them away. Nor is it just a matter of dumping the no-hopers. Committed liberals must also receive the red pencil treatment, however intelligent they may be. It is just too dangerous to allow them access to one's house, with a free licence to look through one's books, vet one's friends, look at odd manuscripts, or come across odd copies of *Instauration*. They are ideological enemies, always ready to justify a stab in the back on moral grounds. God, how I despise them!

My chief problem is the excellent fellows who have been trapped by appalling wives. This has become particularly common since the war, as the upper-class male, unnerved by the collapse of Empire, has taken to marrying women from the stay-at-home, safety-first bourgeoisie. The only solution is to maintain relations of distant cordiality with the wives and meet the husbands at clubs, or at

sports meetings. I agree that there are also wonderful women married to appalling men, but in so far as they tolerate their husbands, they become even more of a problem, because they find it difficult to distinguish between a friend and a lover.

Do not think that I spend all my time lecturing my family, friends and acquaintances about the politics of race. All that I demand is that relevant remarks of that nature should not be ruled out of court. In my opinion, a conversation of any kind which is conducted without any genuflection to the established dogmas is in itself a political act, whether it is with an old lady on the virtues of different herbs, with a farmer about fruit trees, or with a visitor about the arts. All informed discussion of the real world must necessarily deal with the differences between closely related phenomena, and this differentiation inevitably conflicts with the doctrine of abstract egalitarianism.

Once the cleansed hierarchy has been established, even if only from our point of view, it is possible to go much further. Measures taken to combat crime, especially when the police encourage them, are a good starting point, and lead to much closer social cooperation. This leads naturally on to the immigrant question, and actual political influence can then be wielded. Eventually, we shall be able to strike back, instead of just defending ourselves.

Now, I am not saying that I have managed to create a paradise, but our lives are a great deal more tolerable than those of people who just drift along with the tide, insulted at the dinner table by ghastly Jews, lectured on morality by creeping liberals, forced to act as nursemaids to other people's defective dependents, saddled with demoralised, drug-addicted teenagers, deafened with disgusting pop music, forced to pay through the nose for every little service, and impoverished by the charity industry. Well, they have left their beds unmade and must lie in them. Often, their willingness to sell out their own people has resulted in their getting more money, but at what cost! Wealth lies not in money but in human skills, which can be much more effectively mobilised through a social network of common interests. Majority solidarity is not just the precondition of our ultimate survival but also of our present well-being.

## Find out about the British National Party

Send 20p for information pack.

To:  
P.O. BOX 115  
HOVE  
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB  
(Tel. 0273 777540)

Name .....

Address .....

I enclose .....